

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5, 10, 11, 12 and 13 have been amended without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1 – 26 remain in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-6, 8, 13-22 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Curtiss et al. (Curtiss) Pub. No.: US 2003/0162562. Claims 7 and 9-12 and 23 were rejected as being unpatentable over Curtiss in view of Bozoukov (6,603,986).

Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 5, 10, 12 and 13 to more clearly define the invention. Each of the independent claims has been amended to recite that the accessory side is performing the steps for self-configuration without accessing the radio/communication device. No new matter has been added. Support for this amendment is found in FIG. 2 and page 6, lines 1-17 as well as page 6, line 21-23.

The Curtiss reference utilizes the electronic device side in all updates. Referring to paragraph [0056] cited by the Examiner, Curtiss teaches “At step 728 a comparison occurs between the control data version ID read from the accessory memory and control data version IDs that are stored on the electronic device...In one embodiment the electronic device performs the comparison while in another embodiment the accessory includes apparatus to perform the comparison.” Applicants respectfully argue that even if Curtis performs the comparison at the accessory side, Curtiss must still access the IDs stored in the electronic device to do so. No such access to the radio/communication device is performed for accessory self-configuration by Applicant’s invention as claimed. Neither Curtiss nor Bozoukov taken individually or in combination teach that which is recited by Applicant’s amended claims.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 1, 10, 12, and 13 is believed to be overcome. Claims 2-4, 6-9, 14-26 provide further limitations to what are believed to be allowable independent claims and hence are also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-26 is overcome.

The Applicants believe that the subject application is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc, with any fees which may be required in the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

July 3, 2006

Motorola, Inc.
8000 West Sunrise Boulevard
Law Department – MD1610
Plantation, Florida 33322
Customer Number: 24273

By: Barbara R. Doutre/ _____
Barbara R. Doutre
Reg. No.: 39,505
Tel: 954-723-6449
Fax: 954-723-3871
E-Mail: docketing.florida@motorola.com